Solicitation Number: SOL-367-13-000021

Subject: Final Evaluation for USAID/Nepal Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and
    Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP)
Issue Date: August 6, 2013
Closing Date: August 22, 2013

USAID/Nepal seeks to contract professional services to conduct a final evaluation of the Monitoring Nepal's Peace process and Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP) Project.   As authorized under Section 7077 of Public Law 112-74, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (P.L. 112-74), "Local Competition Authority," USAID/Nepal limits this competition to local entities. Local entity means an individual, a corporation, a nonprofit organization, or another body of persons that –

(1) is legally organized under the laws of Nepal;
(2) has as its principal place of business or operations in Nepal; and
(3) either is—
(A) majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of Nepal; or
(B) managed by a governing body the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of Nepal.

This evaluation will focus on activities implemented during the life of the project of the current Cooperative Agreement (September 2009 – December 2013). The MNPPCDP program does not have any sub-partners and coordinates with other donors, namely Norway and the DFID, who have been its supporters since the beginning. The principal objectives of the program are as follows:
- Observe implementation of the peace process and constitution drafting process with a focus on the local level;
- Conduct a limited observation of the Election Commission's voter registration efforts;
- Issue regular public and private reports on the Center's findings, including recommendations and policy suggestions;
- Conduct high-level meetings with Nepali political leaders and policymakers to discuss the Center's findings and ongoing obstacles in the peace and constitutional processes;
- Hold regular briefings for project donors and relevant international stakeholders as well as regular meetings with Nepali political and civil society leaders;
- Observe Nepal's next national elections which may take place in November 2013 or April 2014;
- Transfer the aspects of The Carter Center's observation expertise and data to Nepali stakeholders prior to departure.

The mission will negotiate compensation for this assignment. The successful offeror will be assigned under a Purchase Order (PO) for the deliverables as described in the Statement of Work. If awarded, the contractor must complete the deliverables within the final negotiated cost and dates. If you are interested, please provide USAID/Nepal Office of Acquisition and Assistance (OAA) with your proposal at your earliest opportunity, but no later than Thursday, August 22, 2013. Your proposal should include the following:

1. Current CV(s)
2. Reference list, including most recent three assignments
3. An expression of interest and your proposal to accomplish deliverables
4. Proposed daily rate and documentation to support proposed rate and other associated costs such as travel, per diem etc.

The attached SOW outlines what USAID/Nepal expects, to be accomplished; however, future minor adjustments may be incorporated. The final SOW will be included in the official purchase order. This solicitation in no way obligates USAID/Nepal to award a PO/Contract nor does it commit USAID/Nepal to pay any cost incurred in the preparation and submission of the proposal. Do not incur any expense or begin work until notified that a contract has been awarded to you, in writing, by the Contracting Officer. Please refer any questions you may have regarding this announcement to OAA, via email at KathmanduSAP@usaid.gov.

Please see below documents in the continuation pages.

1. SOW
2. General Instructions to Offerors
3. Selection Criteria

Table of Contents:

Acronyms

Introduction

Project Information

- Project Background
- Project Approach
- Target Areas and Groups
- Project Objectives

Implementation Partners

Evaluation Purpose

Audience and Intended Uses

Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Design and Methodology

Reference Documents and Stakeholder

Evaluation Products

- Deliverables
- Reporting Guidelines

Team Composition

Technical Instructions to Offerers

Evaluation Management

- Logistics
- USAID Participation
- Scheduling
- Payment Schedule and Reporting Requirements
- Budget

Evaluation Criteria

Terms and Conditions of the Consultancy

Annexes

Acronyms:

CBOs	Community based organizations
CDO	Chief District Officer
CeLRRd	Center for Legal Research and Resource Development
CSO	Civil society organizations
CTIP	Combating Trafficking in Persons
DCCHT	District Committee for Controlling Human Trafficking
FFP	Family Financial Planning
FWLD	Forum for Women, Law and Development
GMSS	Gramin Mahila Swabhalambhan Sahakari Sansthan
GON	Government of Nepal
IACG	Inter Agency Coordination Group
IEC	Information, education, and communication
KSL	Kathmandu School of Law
LACC	Legal Aid Consultancy Center
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOWCSW	Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Welfare
NCCHT	National Committee for Controlling Human Trafficking
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
NIDS	Nepal Institute for Development Studies
NJA	National Judicial Academy
NMS	National Minimum Standards
NTWG	Nepal Tamang Women Ghedung
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PPR	Forum for Protection of People's Rights
TIP	Trafficking in persons
TPO	Transcultural Psychosocial Organization
SMN	Safe Migration Networks
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
VDC	Village Development Committee
WEI	World Education Inc.

Acronyms:

CA	Constitutional Assembly
MNPPCDP	Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting Process
CBO	Community based organizations
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
DFID	Department for International Development (of the United Kingdom)
DGO	Democracy and Governance Office
DUNS	Data Universal Numbering System
ECN	Election Commission Nepal
IFES	International Foundation for Electoral Systems
GON	Government of Nepal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organizations
SAM	System for Award Management
SOW	Statement of Work
TCC	The Carter Center
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

Final Evaluation for USAID/Nepal Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP)

1. Introduction

This evaluation will focus on activities implemented during the life of the project of the current Cooperative Agreement (September 2009 – December 2013). The MNPPCDP program does not have any sub-partners and coordinates with other donors, namely Norway and the DFID, who have been its supporters since the beginning. The principal objectives of the program are as follows:

- Observe implementation of the peace process and constitution drafting process with a focus on the local level;
- Conduct a limited observation of the Election Commission's voter registration efforts;
- Issue regular public and private reports on the Center's findings, including recommendations and policy suggestions;
- Conduct high-level meetings with Nepali political leaders and policymakers to discuss the Center's findings and ongoing obstacles in the peace and constitutional processes;
- Hold regular briefings for project donors and relevant international stakeholders as well as regular meetings with Nepali political and civil society leaders;
- Observe Nepal's next national elections which may take place in November 2013 or April 2014;
- Transfer the aspects of The Carter Center's observation expertise and data to Nepali stakeholders prior to departure.

2. Background

After eleven years of armed insurgency, a window of opportunity for peace and reconciliation in Nepal opened in November 2006 with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Government of Nepal and the Maoists. Following the 2006 CPA, The Carter Center received letters of invitation from the government, major party leaders, and the Election Commission to observe Nepal's Constitution Assembly (CA) election in 2008. Following the CA election this program supported the constitution drafting process by creating public awareness of the process and by updating the progress.

Since 2009, The Carter Center has implemented MNPPCDP in each of Nepal's five development regions with the objective of monitoring the country's progress toward a consolidated post-conflict democracy. The Center deployed teams of international and Nepali long-term observers to meet regularly with citizens, political parties, government officials, civil society, marginalized groups, and others in order to understand concerns at the local level. The observers share their findings with political leaders, former CA members, and other stakeholders, including the international donor community, and the media. The observers focus on key elements of the peace process, including implementation of past agreements, public participation, and perceptions of the constitutional process. The observers observe the Election Commission of Nepal's election programs and its components i.e. voter registration, election programs.

The Center has developed a deep network of political contacts across the entire country, having visited all 75 districts since 2007, most of them on multiple occasions, and retained access to the highest levels of political decision-makers.

3. Project Background, Development Hypothesis & Activities

MNPPCDP Identification Data
Program Title: Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP)
Program Number: Cooperative Agreement No. 367-A-00-09-00002-00
Implementing Organization: The Carter Center (TCC)
Program Dates: September 2009 - December 2013
Program Funding: $2,600,000

Final Evaluation for USAID/Nepal Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP)

With the contributions of two other donors, USAID co-funded MNPPCDP after receiving an unsolicited application on September 3, 2009. The program formally started on June 2009 through the assistance of DFID and Norway. The activity supports the US Mission to Nepal's Country Assistance Strategy (2009-2013) USG Priority Assistance Goal 1: Successful Transition Completed toward an Effective, Responsive and Democratic Constitutional Government. Under Goal 1, the MNPPCDP supports the assistance approach to "Monitor the political transition and improve public understanding of it" that includes supporting organizations and civil society in monitoring: the constitutional drafting process; adherence by all parties to human rights and democratic principles; preparations for elections; and the status of local governance.

> Agreement Officer Representative (AOR): Sumitra Manandhar

The project is based on the development hypothesis that if the citizens are provided with accurate, current and impartial information about the key aspects of the peace process, constitution drafting process, voter registration program, and national electoral process, they can effectively participate, influences, and contribute to the democratic process of Nepal. If the policy makers, key political leaders, and civil society leaders are made aware of the peoples' concerns and the ground realities, it is most likely that they will take those into account in their decision making and peace process and constitution drafting process.

The MNPPCDP has four main Activities:

Activity 1: Observe Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting

The program has the following sub activities:
i. Conduct regional and district observation to track the peace process, constitution drafting, security environment, political party activities, and other related issues using teams of international and Nepali national observers. The Teams are based in major hub cities: Biratnagar (Eastern Region), Kathmandu (Central Region), Pokhara (Western Region), Nepalgunj (Mid-Western Region), and Dhangadhi (Far-Western Region).
ii. Track the constitutional drafting process and related government activity. As part of its larger observation activities, the Center especially watches for efforts to increase public awareness and participation at the local level; specifically those of historically marginalized groups such as Madhesis, Janajatis, Dalits, and women.
iii. Issue regular reports to increase access to accurate information about key peace processes and constitutional developments at the local level.
iv. Engage with national and local political leaders to address political challenges as appropriate.
v. Conduct regular briefing sessions with international stakeholders and coordinate closely with national stakeholders.
vi. Communicate national findings at the local level.

Activity 2: Conduct a limited observation of the voter registration process

The program has the following sub activities:
i. Deploy existing observation teams to focus their efforts on voter registration in their assigned regions at several points in time.
ii. Use supplemental visits from an expert consultant to assist in the implementation of the voter registration observer's training and deployment.
iii. Collaborate closely with the ECN, UNDP Electoral Support Program, IFES, and domestic observer networks and civil society organizations.

Activity 3: Conduct an international election observation mission if national elections are called.

In this case, the program has the following sub activities:
i. Long-term observation.
ii. Pre- and post-election assessment missions.
iii. Direct interventions by President Carter and/or a former regional leader.
iv. Short term observation delegation for elections.
v. Issuance of periodic reports.

Activity 4: Local capacity building and sustainability.
  i. Conduct a scoping exercise to transfer the MNPPCDP database to a national university or organization before MNPPCDP ends and The Carter Center leaves Nepal.
  ii. Deliver an assessment of the local organization's internal capacities and expertise to identify a collaborating organization.

4.   The Evaluation: Purpose, Audience & Use

USAID/Nepal will contract a local firm to conduct the final evaluation that assesses the MNPPCDP's overall effectiveness and progress towards the above stated activities. The purpose of the evaluation is to assist the Mission through the evaluations findings of MNPPCDP's project implementation, and the contractor's recommendations for future programs. The evaluation will clearly articulate the results achieved to help stakeholders understand the impact of the MNPPCDP's above activities. The evaluation team should state recommendations that guide USAID's future programming, improve the achievement of results, and reduce the risk of unintended consequences. The evaluation team will need to consider the external environment, project methodology, and the escalation of activities when assessing opportunities and threats. The focus of the evaluation is defined by the evaluation questions in the next section.

The primary audience of this evaluation will be USAID/Nepal's Democracy and Governance Office, partner donors (DFID and Norway), and The Carter Center. Additional recipients of the report will be USAID/Washington's Asia Bureau and the State Department and other relevant stakeholders. The report's Executive Summary could be shared with organizations involved in Nepal's peace process such as the ECN, the CA Secretariat, major political parties, and other stakeholders benefiting from MNPPCDP analysis and communication.

USAID/Nepal will use the findings, recommendations, and lessons learned from this evaluation in ongoing programs focusing on political parties and elections. TCC will learn about their strengths and weaknesses, adjusting their programs accordingly in the future, if applicable.

5.   Evaluation Questions

The evaluation must be framed in order to answer the key evaluation questions listed below.

The evaluation must be framed in order to answer the key evaluation questions listed below.

1. How effective was the program in engaging women, youth, dalits, differently abled and other marginalized groups during the monitoring of peace and constitution drafting processes and in bringing their issues to influence these processes? Do citizens feel that their voices have been heard through this program?

2. How have the findings of Carter Centre's analytical work such as field visit reports, press releases contributed to policy level decisions and to help shape programs and strategies of stakeholders such as CSOs, USAID projects, ECN, GON and donor communities? How have the briefing meetings organized by TCC and the sharing of information from the field at these meetings benefitted the stakeholders? What other information would have been more helpful for the stakeholders?

3. In what ways the report on "limited observation of the Election Commission of Nepal's (ECN) voter registration program" contributed to strengthening Election Commission's voter registration process?

4. What are further opportunities and challenges for making the long term observation process more efficient and effective?

5. What else can be done to build local capacity in addition to transferring database to national university? Would 'something is left behind' is sufficient to help in building sustainability?

6.   Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation team must employ a participatory approach to collect data and information that will be needed to answer the evaluation questions. The evaluators must use a wide range of methods and approaches for collecting and analyzing the information to assess MNPPCDP. Information can be collected

through a review and analysis of secondary information paired with collection and analysis of primary information. Triangulation of findings will be required to address any inherent bias. The evaluation team must be prepared to conduct interviews with key stakeholder informants, as well as conduct site visits and team planning meetings.

The contractor's proposed evaluation methodology must be approved by USAID/Nepal before employing the methodology and beginning the evaluation. The evaluation team must incorporate any feedback provided by USAID/Nepal on the methodology. It is anticipated that the evaluation team leader, assisted by a team member, will facilitate and conduct a team planning meeting to discuss evaluation methodology and to develop data collection plan. USAID/Nepal's point of contact will participate in the team planning meeting with other DGO staff involved, as appropriate. The agenda will include, but is not limited to, the following items:

- Define each team members' roles and responsibilities;
- Review and finalize the assignment timeline and share with USAID;
- Finalize a work plan for the evaluation;
- Finalize data collection plans and tools;
- Review and clarify any logistical and administrative procedures for the assignment;
- Develop a preliminary draft outline of the team's report; and
- Assign drafting responsibilities for the final report.

7.   Data Analysis Methods

Prior to the start of data collection, the evaluation team must develop and present a data analysis plan that details how stakeholder interviews will be transcribed and analyzed, what procedures will be used to analyze qualitative data from key stakeholder interviews, and how the evaluation will weigh and integrate qualitative data from these sources with quantitative data from project monitoring records to reach conclusions for USAID review and approval.

8.   Data Collection Methods & Sources

Collection of primary data must emphasize a participatory approach with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Semi-structured interviews with focus groups and key informants will also be used. Roundtables and short workshops might also be appropriate for assessment and learning with implementing partners, USAID/Nepal staff, NGOs, relevant donors, and the Government of Nepal. Evaluators must rely on a number of sources and techniques to answer the evaluation questions. Evaluators must select the sites and activities independently.

The program evaluation team must:

- Review MNPPCDP project documents, work plans, M&E plans, annual and semi-annual reports, performance monitoring plans, and other MNPPCDP related technical documents or studies.
- Interview key stakeholders including program related donors, government counterparts, political parties, and civil society representatives.
- Interview TCC and its national and international long term observers.
- Conduct specific field visits and observe the activities in action, if the timing permits.
- Review additional documents and reports made available by DGO.

9.   Timeline and Deliverables

The timeline for this SOW is December 16, 2013 to February 15, 2014 if the selected Offeror has a DUNS and SAM number.[1] Otherwise the time needed for a contractor to obtain the DUNS and SAM numbers will move the expected start date by up to six weeks. About forty-five days are expected for the assessment period. This timeline includes thirty-seven working days and some flexibility for unexpected interruptions or holidays, when applicable.

---

[1] See http://www.dnb.com/get-a-duns-number.html and https://www.sam.gov/portal/public/SAM/

Estimated No. of Work Days	No. of Actual Work Days	Activities
Day 1- Day 5	5	Methodology approval, documentation review, planning, and initial Kathmandu-based interviews
Day 6 - Day 20	15	Field work (including travel to and from field sites)
Day 21 – Day 25	5	Internal review of findings and initial debrief to USAID
Day 26– Day 32	7	Draft evaluation report delivered
Day 33-39	0	USAID provides feedback to the draft report
Day 40-43	4	Finalize evaluation report and submit to USAID along with raw data and records
Day 44-45	1	Deliver the final presentation, as scheduled by USAID, to outline major findings, recommendations, and lessons learned, as well as electronic submission to USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse

The dates and timeline provided above are tentative. Submission of the draft report will be made no later than 20 days after field work is completed. USAID/Nepal will provide comments within seven working days of the submission of the draft report. A revised final report will be submitted within four working days after receipt of comments from USAID/Nepal. The evaluation report will be final only after it is cleared, in writing, by USAID/Nepal.

To make field time as efficient as possible, preparation must include completing a majority of the documentation review, establishing interview guides, developing team protocol and responsibilities, and establishing them in an evaluation schedule. As outlined above, deliverables include:

1. A presentation of the chosen evaluation methodology to USAID/Nepal for approval.

2. A detailed work plan for the entire evaluation period submitted for approval.

3. Two PowerPoint Presentations for 1) an internal and 2) external audience on important findings, recommendations, and lessons learned.

4. Two hard copies of the final evaluation report, not exceeding 30 pages (excluding graphs, diagrams, tables, annexes, cover pages, and table of contents) held within good quality spiral binding.

5. Two electronic copies of the final report delivered in both Microsoft Word and PDF and the final report's submission to the Development Experience Clearinghouse.[2]

6. Submission of all raw data and records supporting the evaluation (e.g. interview transcripts, survey responses, etc.) organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation. All quantitative data collected should be in an easily readable format. The raw data is owned and archived by USAID and will be made available to the public, barring rare exceptions as alerted by the contractor.

The evaluation report must demonstrate a clear line of analysis between findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The report must be in concise and clear English with visual summaries such as graphics, charts, and summary data tables. The final report will include annexes describing all instruments used for data collection and corresponding data summaries performed during the evaluation. The evaluation report must meet the criteria outlined in Section 11 "Reporting Guidelines" found below.

The evaluation team leader must also submit one electronic or hard copy of the final evaluation to the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) with a cover sheet indicating the type of evaluation and the design. Submission online is preferred and can be sent to docsubmit@dec.cdie.org. If choosing to send a hard copy to the DEC, please mail to the address below.

---

[2] See http://dec.usaid.gov/ for details on how to submit documents.

Document Acquisitions
USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC)
8403 Colesville Road, Suite 210
Silver Spring, MD 20910-6368
Telephone: 1-301-562-0641
Fax: 1-301-588-7787

Whether email or mailing the final evaluation report, the contractor must generate proof of submission.

10.   Payment Schedule and Reporting Requirements

USAID/Nepal intends to offer a Fixed Price Purchase Order for this evaluation. USAID/Nepal will provide incremental payments upon completion and acceptance of the following benchmarks or deliverables by the designated Agreement Officer's Representative.

- 30 percent upon completion and approval of deliverables no. 1 and 2 of the methodology and work plan as a mobilization advance
- 40 percent upon submission and approval of deliverables no. 3 and 4, of the methodology and work plan as a mobilization advance
- 40 percent upon the completion and approval of deliverables no. 5&6, final report and all deliverables specified in Section 9

11.   Reporting Guidelines

USAID/Nepal requires that the evaluation team review USAID's *Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report,* which can be accessed online at:
http://transition.usaid.gov/evaluation/USAIDEvaluationPolicy.pdf as mentioned above, findings from the evaluation will be presented in a draft report with an initial brief to USAID/Nepal. The evaluation report must adhere to the page limit and contain the following:

1. **Executive Summary** – concisely state the purpose, background, main evaluation questions, methods, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned (if applicable) from the evaluation (2-3 pages)

2. **Table of Contents** (1 page)

3. **Introduction** – purpose, audience, and synopsis of task (1-2 pages)

4. **Background** – brief overview of MNPPCDP in Nepal, program strategy and activities implemented, and purpose of the evaluation (2-3 pages)

5. **Methodology** – describe evaluation methods, including constraints and gaps (1-2 pages)

6. **Findings, Lessons Learned and Conclusions** (10-15 pages)

7. **Recommendations and Future Directions** (2-5 pages)

8. **References** (including bibliographical documentation, meetings, interviews and focus group discussions)

9. **Annexes** – annexes should be succinct, pertinent and readable and document the evaluation methods, schedules, data collection, data summaries, interview lists, and table of raw data available.

The final report must be clear and grammatically correct in order to be accepted by USAID/Nepal. It is required that the final evaluation report be prepared and orally presented by a native or highly proficient English speaker. As described in Section 9 "Timeline & Deliverables" a full version of the evaluation report must be submitted to USAID/Nepal in hard copy as well as electronically. The report format must be restricted to Microsoft products and 12-point type font must be used throughout the body of the report, with

page margins 1" top/bottom and left/right. The report should not exceed 30 pages, excluding references and annexes.

12.   Composition of the Evaluation Team & Conflicts of Interest

The evaluation team must be made up of three non-USAID development professionals with expertise in democracy and governance (DG) and in designing and conducting evaluations.

Team Leader: The Team Leader must have, at minimum, a Master's degree, although Ph.D. is preferable, in the areas of political science, social science, or a related subject area. S/he must have broad technical experience with the function and operation of political parties, legislative parliament, and electoral systems in Nepal. The Evaluation Team Leader should have over five years of recent experience as a lead in designing and conducting project evaluations. The Team Leader should also have in-depth experience assessing political change, identifying barriers to democratization, and developing DG strategies and programming options. Knowledge of DG, elections and peace process literature would be useful as well.

Team Members: A Team Member must be an expert in peace process with at least five years of recent experiences in managing or evaluating projects and programs in the areas related to peace processes. The second member of the team must have at least five years of management and evaluation experience in DG, elections related projects and programs. Both the team members must have at least Master's degree in the relevant areas and extensive knowledge on Nepal's political development over the last decade. The team members must be able to conduct interviews and discussions in both Nepali and English.

The Offeror must disclose in his/her/their proposal any real or potential conflicts of interest, such as those identified in Attachment 3 below, on the part of the Offeror or any member of the evaluation team.

13.   Technical Instructions to Offerors for Proposal Submission

Potential Offerors are required to submit proposals to USAID/Nepal either:

By emailing KathmanduSAP@usaid.gov with attachments in Microsoft Word or Excel format with the subject line "Final Evaluation of MNPPCDP" or;

Via regular mail or hand delivery that includes one original and one paper copy of the technical and cost proposal marking the envelope with "Final Evaluation of MNPPCDP Project" to:

> Ms. Srijana Rana
> Office of Acquisition and Assistance
> U.S. Agency for International Development
> U.S. Embassy Building
> GPO Box 295
> Maharajgunj
> Kathmandu, Nepal

The length of the proposal will not exceed <u>ten</u> pages. The sections on budget, curriculum vitae of key personnel and references from previous work do not count against the page limit. Offerors are encouraged to avoid copying sections from this SOW in their proposals. At minimum, the proposal must include:

- A brief overview and background about the proposal and the organization.
- Methods of quantitative and qualitative data collection that will be used to answer each evaluation questions as well as the type of data, how the data will be analyzed, and what kind of information will be generated from said data. The methods must correspond to each evaluation question and include data sources.
- Strategies for choosing sample population for data collection and how biases will be minimized.
- Plans for data analysis – quantitative and qualitative, explaining how these analyses will help answer each evaluation question.
- Detailed work plans that include all the activities that will be carried out during the evaluation and their timelines as well as the management of logistics for the evaluation.

- The Budget (in Excel spreadsheet) as per the format outlined in Section 16 below (this will not be counted toward the page limit) will be complete and respond to the work period, travel requirements, and deliverables.
- CVs of the team leader and other team members as well as any organization profiles applicable and contact details of two recent referees for each team member. CVs must not be more than <u>two</u> pages per team member – (this will not be counted toward the page limit).
- Proposed tools for data collection (this will not be counted toward the page limit).

The Offeror will assume all costs incurred to assemble and deliver this proposal. USAID will not be held responsible for any costs incurred during the pre-contractual stage.

14. Contractor Registration

All prospective U.S. Government contractors are required to obtain a DUNS number and to complete the System for Award Management (SAM) registration before a contract may be awarded. To learn more and to begin the registration process, please visit the following websites:

DUNS number: http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform

SAM registration: http://www.sam.gov

Proposals may be submitted under this RFP without a DUNS number or SAM registration. However, the successful awardee will be required to obtain both of them and submit evidence of registration to USAID before an award is made. The registration process may take many weeks to complete. Therefore, offerors are encouraged to obtain them early so that, if selected, the award will not be delayed.

Completion of an early registration does not constitute any commitment on the part of the U.S. Government to make an award.

15.   Source & Nationality Requirements for Procurement of Commodities & Services Financed by USAID

The Foreign Assistance Act Section 604(a) authorizes procurement "from the United States, recipient country or developing countries," which is implemented by 22 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 228 and USAID's Automated Directives System (ADS) Chapter 310. The authorized source for this procurement is Geographic Code 937, as defined in ADS 310.

Suppliers with a nationality outside of the United States, the recipient country, or developing countries will only be considered for this procurement if a waiver is authorized under 22 CFR Part 228 Subpart D.

16.   Logistics & USAID Participation

The evaluation team is responsible for managing all logistics required for completing the evaluation. This includes, but is not limited to, arranging for transportation, meeting venues, and appointments for meetings.

USAID/Nepal will provide key documents and background materials for reading and help arrange the in-briefing and debriefing. Exact participation of USAID will be determined after the selection of the consultants, but a selected authority from USAID/Nepal may accompany the team for introductions to Senior GON officials and select stakeholders or during select field visits. The USAID/Nepal DGO staff will provide contacts for meetings and a list of the suggested site visits for the team to arrange meetings. Sumitra Manandhar, the MNPPCDP Agreement Officer Representative will work as the contact point for this contract.

17.   Budget

The Team Leader is expected to submit a proposed budget along with proposed team members. The items in the proposed budget should include daily rate, per diem, in-country airfare, vehicle rental, and other direct cost such as stationery, photocopy, utilities, venue rental, IT, etc. The group accident insurance is compulsory for the members and is the responsibility of the contractor. Total estimated cost range from $45,000 not to exceed $52,000. Cost proposal should be submitted in both US$ and local

currency using $1:Rs. 80 exchange rate. Offerers are expected to submit a cost estimate as per the sample template below.

Item	Cost Element	No. of Units	Unit	Rate	Total Amount
1	Consultancy Fees				
	Team Leader		Days		
	Local Consultant		Days		
	Local Consultant		Days		
2	Per diem (In-country)		Days		
3	Airfare (In-country)		trips		
4	Other Direct Costs*				
5	Total Direct Costs				
6	Fixed Fee				
	Grand Total				

* stationary, photocopy, utilities, venue, IT, vehicle rental in field (days), group accident insurance cost (person) etc.

18.   Evaluation Criteria

The technical proposal is weighed as more important than the proposal's cost during the proposal review process and best value decision. While the cost proposal submitted by the Offerors will be an important factor in determining the best value, the criteria for selection will be based primarily on the four points below. Offerors should note that these criteria: (1) serve as the standard against which all proposals will be evaluated, and (2) serve to identify the significant matters which Offerors should address in their proposals. The evaluation criteria and point valued (as weighted by the percentage) are as follows:

1. Evaluation Methodology/approach: (35%)
    *   Appropriateness of data collection methods to answer the evaluation questions
    *   Use of quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection
    *   Plan for data analysis
    *   Sampling strategies – including strategies to ensure participation of men and women and other relevant stakeholders including GON, NGOs and CSOs
    *   Use of participatory methods for data collection

2. Technical Competence: (30%)
    *   Qualification and experience of evaluation team members
    *   Composition of the team with expertise peace processes, election, democracy and governance
    *   Expertise in evaluation of similar programs and projects
    *   Organizational strengths of the firm or individuals

3. Experience: (30%)
    *   Past experience on evaluation of projects and programs including experience of evaluating projects in the relevant areas.
    *   Experience managing logistics for conducting such evaluations
    *   Evaluations conducted for donor or other organizations within the last two years

4. Mobilization Potential: (5%)
    *   Ability and readiness to take-over the assignment in a timely manner to meet the schedule of deliverables, and
    *   Work plan that clearly shows the evaluation activities and timeline and is feasible.

19.   Submission Due Date

Applications will be submitted by August 22, 2013.

Attachment 1: Resources and approaches for data collection

Implementing organizations:
The Carter Center to achieve the objectives of USAID program entitled "Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP).

Implementing Organizations: Meetings will be held with implementing partner and stakeholders who are engaged in implementing and/or monitoring activities. If possible, some work should be observed in action. Any training, community meetings, or ongoing construction will provide an opportunity to compare perception of informants with reality of implementation.

Beneficiaries and Affiliated Implementing Partners: Meetings in the field will be held with direct beneficiaries, political parties, former CAs, staff of ECN, youth, men and women from CBOs, local leaders, and people who have been affiliated with the implementation process. Meetings can be a combination of individual and focus group interviews and group discussions.

Interviews with the other implementers: To gain a different perspective of implementation approaches and issues, the evaluation team will need to meet with other USAID/Nepal contractors/implementing partners or other donors who are implementing similar programs in Nepal.

Local government representatives: To look at ties the program helped build with the local communities and the government, the evaluation team will need to meet the local branch of political parties, the District Election Office (DEO), local bodies (DDC, VDC , municipalities) and some CSOs that implement electoral activities at a grassroots level, .

Attachment 2: Non-Disclosure Agreement

PRECLUSION FROM FURNISHING CERTAIN SERVICES AND RESTRICTION ON USE OF INFORMATION.

With respect to proposal submitted dated August 22, 2013 in response to solicitation # SOL-367-13-000021 of USAID/Nepal's evaluation of USAID-MNPPCDP dated August 6, 2013, the undersigned hereby agrees and certifies to the following:

 (a) This SOW calls for the contractor to furnish important services in support of the evaluation of the USAID/Monitoring Nepal's Peace Process and Constitution Drafting Process (MNPPCDP). In accordance with the principles of FAR Subpart 9.5 and USAID policy, the contractor shall be ineligible to furnish, as a prime or subcontractor or otherwise, implementation services under any contract or task order that results in response to findings, proposals, or recommendations in the evaluation report within 18 months of USAID accepting the report, unless the head of the contracting activity, in consultation with USAID's competition advocate, authorizes a waiver (in accordance FAR 9.503) determining that preclusion of the contractor from the implementation work would not be in the government's interest.

(b) In addition, by accepting this contract, the contractor agrees that it will not use or make available any information obtained about another organization under the contract in the preparation of proposals or other documents in response to any solicitation for a contract or task order.

(c) If the contractor gains access to proprietary information of any other company in performing this evaluation, the contractor must agree with the other company to protect the information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary, and must refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished. Contractor must provide a properly executed copy of all such agreements to the contracting officer.

Signature: _____

Name Typed or Printed: _____

Date: _____

Attachment 3: **Disclosure of Real or Potential Conflict of Interest for USAID Evaluations**

Instructions: *Evaluations of USAID projects will be undertaken so that they are not subject to the perception or reality of biased measurement or reporting due to conflict of interest.[3] For external evaluations, all evaluation team members will provide a signed statement attesting to a lack of conflict of interest or describing an existing conflict of interest relative to the project being evaluated.[4]*

Evaluators of USAID projects have a responsibility to maintain independence so that opinions, conclusions, judgments, and recommendations will be impartial and will be viewed as impartial by third parties. Evaluators and evaluation team members are to disclose all relevant facts regarding real or potential conflicts of interest that could lead reasonable third parties with knowledge of the relevant facts and circumstances to conclude that the evaluator or evaluation team member is not able to maintain independence and, thus, is not capable of exercising objective and impartial judgment on all issues associated with conducting and reporting the work. Operating Unit leadership, in close consultation with the Contracting Officer, will determine whether the real or potential conflict of interest is one that should disqualify an individual from the evaluation team or require recusal by that individual from evaluating certain aspects of the project(s).

In addition, if evaluation team members gain access to proprietary information of other companies in the process of conducting the evaluation, then they must agree with the other companies to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.[5]

Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:

1.   Immediate family or close family members who are employees of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.

2.   Financial interest that is direct, or is significant/ material though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.

3.   Current or previous direct or significant/material though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.

4.   Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.

5.   Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.

6.   Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.

Disclosure of Conflict of Interest

Name	
Title	
Organization	
Evaluation Position	

---

[3] *USAID Evaluation Policy (p. 8); USAID Contract Information Bulletin 99-17; and Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 9.5, Organizational Conflicts of Interest, and Subpart 3.10, Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct.*
[4] *USAID Evaluation Policy (p. 11)*
[5] *FAR 9.505-4(b)*

Evaluation Award Number *(contract or other instrument)*	
USAID Project(s) Evaluated *(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)*	
I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.	☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts: *Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:* *1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.* *2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.* *3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.* *4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.* *5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.* *6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.*	

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

Signature	
Date	

Attachment 4: Checklist for Evaluation Report Review

Title of study being reviewed: _____

GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENTS OF AN EVALUATION REPORT[6]

Keyed to USAID's 2011 Evaluation Policy

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT						
1. Does the evaluation report have a cover sheet attached indicating the type of evaluation conducted (e.g. performance evaluation or impact evaluation) and general design?						
2. If it is a performance evaluation, does the evaluation report focus on descriptive and normative evaluation questions?						
3. If the evaluation report uses the term "impact evaluation," is it defined as measuring the change in a development outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention (i.e. impact evaluations are based on models of cause and effect and require a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual)?						
4. Regardless of the type of evaluation, does the evaluation report reflect use of sound social science methods?						
5. Does the report have a Table of Contents (TOC)?						
6. Do Lists of Figures and Tables follow the TOC?						
7. Does the report have a Glossary of Terms?						
.1.1 Are abbreviations limited to the essential?						
8. Is the date of the report given?						
9. Does the body of the report adhere to the 20 page guide?						
10. Is the report well-organized (each topic is clearly delineated, subheadings used for easy reading)?						
11. Does the report's presentation highlight important information in ways that capture the reader's attention?						
12. Is the report well written (clear sentences, reasonable length paragraphs, no typos, acceptable for dissemination to potential users)?						
13. Does the evaluation report focus on the essential issues concerning the key questions, and eliminate the "nice to know", but not essential information?						
14. Does the evaluation report disclose either lack of a conflict of interest by all evaluation team members and/or describe any conflict of interest that existed relative to the project being evaluated?						
15. As applicable, does the evaluation report include statements regarding any significant unresolved differences of opinion on the part of funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation team?						
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
16. Does the evaluation report begin with a 3- 5-page stand-alone summary of the purpose, background , main evaluation questions, methods, findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (if applicable) of the evaluation?						
17. Does the Executive Summary concisely state the main points of the evaluation?						
18. Does the Executive Summary follow the rule of only saying what the evaluation itself says and not introducing new material?						
INTRODUCTION						

---

[6] In addition to the USAID 2011 Evaluation Policy, good practices in evaluation reporting have also been drawn from: Morra Imas, Linda and Ray C. Rist. 2009. *The Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.
Scriven, Michael. 2005. *Key Evaluation Checklist.*
Stufflebeam, Daniel L. 1999. *Program Evaluations Metaevaluation Checklist.*

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
19. Does the report introduction adequately describe the project?						
20. Does the introduction explain the problem/opportunity the project was trying to address?						
21. Does the introduction show where the project was implemented (physical location) through a map?						
22. Does the introduction explain when the project was implemented?						
23. Are the "theory of change" or development hypotheses that underlie the project explained? (Does the report specify the project's inputs, direct results (outputs), and higher level outcomes and impacts, so that the reader understands the logical structure of the project and what it was supposed to accomplish?)						
24. Does the report identify assumptions underlying the project?						
25. Does the report include sufficient local and global contextual information so that the external validity and relevance of the evaluation can be assessed?						
26. Does the evaluation report identify and describe any critical competitors to the project that functioned at the same time and in the project's environment?						
27. Is USAID's level of investment in the project stated?						
27.1. Does the evaluation report describe the project components funded by implementing partners and the amount of funding?						
28. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly stated?						
29. Is the amount of USAID funding for the evaluation indicated?						
30. Are all other sources of funding for the evaluation indicated as well as the amounts?						
31. Does the report identify the evaluation team members and any partners in the evaluation?						
32. Is there a clear statement of how the evaluation will be used and who the intended users are?						
33. Are the priority evaluation questions presented in the introduction?						
34. Does the evaluation address all evaluation questions included in the Statement of Work (SOW)?						
34.1. Are any modifications to the SOW, whether in technical requirements, evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, methodology or timeline indicated in the report?						
34.2. Is the SOW presented as an annex?						
34.3. If so, does the annex include the rationale for any change with the written sign-offs on the changes by the technical officer?						
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY						
35. Does the report provide a clear description of the evaluation's design?						
35.1. Is a design matrix or similar written tool presented in an annex that shows *for each question/sub question* the measure(s) or indicator(s) used to address it, the source(s) of the information, the type of evaluation design, type of sampling if used, data collection instrument(s) used, and the data analysis plan?						
36. Does the report state the period over which the evaluation was conducted?						
37. Does the report state the project time span covered by the evaluation?						
38. Does the evaluation report indicate the nature and extent of consultation on the evaluation design with in-country partners and beneficiaries?						
39. Does the evaluation report indicate the nature and extent of participation by national counterparts and evaluators in the design and conduct of the evaluation?						
40. Does the report address each key question around which the evaluation was designed?						
41. Is at least one of the evaluation questions directly related to gender analysis of outcomes and impacts?						
42. Are data sex-disaggregated? By age? By ethnic and religious group?						

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
Geographical location?						
43. In answering the questions, does the report appropriately use comparisons made against baseline data?						
44. If the evaluation is expected to influence resource allocation, does it include information on the cost structure and scalability of the intervention, as well as its effectiveness?						
45. As appropriate, does the report include financial data that permits computation of unit costs and analysis of cost structure?						
46. Is there a clear description of the evaluation's data collection methods (summarized in the text with the full description presented in an annex)?						
46.1. Are all tools (questionnaires, checklists, discussion guides, and other data collection instruments) used in the evaluation provided in an annex?						
46.2. Does the evaluation report include information, as appropriate, on the pilot testing of data collection instruments?						
46.3. Does the evaluation report include information, as appropriate, on the training of data collectors?						
47. Are all sources of information properly identified and listed in an annex?						
48. Does the evaluation report contain an section describing the "strengths" and "limitations" associated with the evaluation methodology (e.g. selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, small samples, only went to villages near the road, implementer insisted on picking who the team met with, etc.)?						
49. Does the evaluation report indicate the evaluation methodology took into account the time, budget, and other practical considerations for the evaluation such as minimizing disruption and data burden?						
50. Does the report have sufficient information to determine if the evaluation team had the appropriate methodological and subject matter expertise to conduct the evaluation as designed?						
51. If an impact evaluation was designed and conducted, does the evaluation report indicate that experimental methods were used to generate the strongest evidence? Or does the report indicate that alternative methods for assessing impact were utilized and present the reasons why random assignment strategies were not feasible?						
52. Does the evaluation report reflect the application and use to the maximum extent possible of social science methods and tools that reduce the need for evaluator-specific judgments?						
53. Does the evaluation scope and methodology section address generalizability of the findings?						
ANALYSIS						
54. Are percentages, ratios, cross-tabulations, rather than raw data presented as appropriate?						
55. When percentages are given, does the report always indicate the number of cases used to calculate the percentage?						
56. Is use of percentages avoided when the number of cases is small (<10)?						
57. Are whole numbers used or rounding-off numbers to 1 or 2 digits?						
58. Are pictures used to good effect?						
58.1. Relevant to the content?						
58.2. Called out in the text and placed near the call-out?						
59. Are charts and graphs used to present or summarize data where relevant?						
59.1. Are the graphics easy to read and simple enough to communicate the message without much text?						
59.2. Are they consistently numbered and titled?						
59.3. Are they clearly labeled (axis, legend, etc.)?						
59.4. Is the source of the data identified?						
59.5. Are they called out in the text and correctly placed near						

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
the call-out?						
59.6. Are the scales honest (proportional and not misleading by virtue of being "blown-up")?						
FINDINGS						
60. Are FINDINGS specific, concise and supported by strong quantitative and qualitative evidence?						
60.1. As appropriate, does the report indicate confirmatory evidence for FINDINGS from multiple sources, data collection methods, and analytic procedures?						
61. Is adequate data provided to address the validity of the "theory of change" or development hypothesis underlying the project, i.e., cause and effect relationships?						
62. Are alternative explanations of any observed results discussed, if found?						
63. Are unplanned results the team discovered adequately described?						
64. Are opinions, conclusions, and recommendations kept out of the description of FINDINGS?						
CONCLUSIONS						
65. Is there a clear distinction between CONCLUSIONS and FINDINGS?						
66. Is every CONCLUSION in the report supported by a specific or clearly defined set of FINDINGS?						
67. Are the CONCLUSIONS credible, given the FINDINGS the report presents?						
68. Can the reader tell what CONCLUSIONS the evaluation team reached on each evaluation question?						
RECOMMENDATIONS						
69. Are RECOMMENDATIONS separated from CONCLUSIONS? (Are they highlighted, presented in a separate section or otherwise marked so that the reader sees them as being distinct?)						
70. Are all RECOMMENDATIONS supported by a specific or clearly defined set of FINDINGS and CONCLUSIONS? (Clearly derived from what the evaluation team learned?)						
71. Are the RECOMMENDATIONS practical and specific?						
72. Are the RECOMMENDATIONS responsive to the purpose of the evaluation?						
73. Are the RECOMMENDATIONS action-oriented?						
74. Is it clear who is responsible for each action?						
75. Are the RECOMMENDATIONS limited/grouped into a reasonable number?						
LESSONS LEARNED						
76. Did this evaluation include lessons that would be useful for future projects or programs, on the same thematic or in the same country, etc.?						
77. Are the LESSONS LEARNED highlighted and presented in a clear way?						
78. Does the report indicate who the lessons are for? (e.g., project implementation team, future project, USAID and implementing partners, etc.)						
BOTTOM LINE						
79. Does the evaluation report give the appearance of a thoughtful, evidence-based, and well organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project and what did not and why?						
80. As applicable, does the evaluation report include statements regarding any significant unresolved differences of opinion on the part of funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation team?						
81. Is the evaluation report structured in a way that will promote its utilization?						
82. Does the evaluation report explicitly link the evaluation questions to specific future decisions to be made by USAID leadership, partner governments and/or other key stakeholders?						
83. Does the evaluation report convey the sense that the evaluation was						

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
undertaken in a manner to ensure credibility, objectivity, transparency, and the generation of high quality information and knowledge?						